

1 *Brookline Preservation Commission*  
2 **MINUTES OF THE June 9, 2020 MEETING**  
3 **Held Virtually using Webex Events Online Software**  
4  
5

6 **Commissioners Present:**

7 Elton Elperin, Chair  
8 Richard Panciera, Vice Chair  
9 David King  
10 Wendy Ecker  
11 David Jack  
12 Peter Kleiner  
13 Jim Batchelor  
14 Elizabeth Armstrong, Alternate

**Commissioners Absent:**

15  
16 **Staff:** Valerie Birmingham, Tina McCarthy  
17

---

18  
19 Mr. Elperin called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.  
20

21 **EXECUTIVE SESSION – Question as to whether the Preservation Commission shall enter into**  
22 **Executive Session for discussion of the ongoing litigation of the 46 Powell Street decision if the**  
23 **chair declares that an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of**  
24 **the public body**  
25

26 Mr. Elperin moved to enter Executive Session. Mr. King seconded the motion. All voted in favor.  
27

28 The Commission entered into Executive Session.  
29

30 Mr. Elperin reopened the public hearing.  
31

32 **Approval of Minutes**  
33

34 There were no minutes for the Commission to review.  
35

36 **Public Comment** (for items not on the agenda)  
37

38 No public comment.  
39

40 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**  
41

42 **159 Aspinwall Avenue** – Application for the demolition of the house (WC Aspinwall 159 LLC,  
43 applicant).  
44

45 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.  
46

Eric Valentino, owner, stated that he could appreciate the original history of the house but commented the existing house was in poor condition.

Sarah Wunsch, 77 Brook Street, remarked about the significance and importance of the house.

Harry Bohrs, 97 Toxteth Street, commented that the house was in keeping with the street, and contributed socially to the area.

Ms. Ecker commented that the grandson of the original owner was also a real estate agent in Brookline, and that the house was interesting.

Mr. King remarked that the house was significant for the reasons outlined by staff.

Mr. Panciera moved to uphold staff's initial determination of significance, and impose a twelve month stay of demolition on 159 Aspinwall Avenue which would expire on June 9, 2021. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

**45 Stearns Road** – Application for the demolition of the house (Access Development LLC, applicant).

Ms. McCarthy presented the case.

Jennifer Depazo Gilbert, Law Office of Robert L. Allen Jr., LLP, introduced the applicants. Dan Adelson, owner, commented that he planned to restore wherever possible. Amir Kripper, Kripper Architecture Studio, Inc. stated that the siding is not original and that in his opinion the porch had been added at a later date; further Mr. Kripper commented that he did not see a lot of architectural detailing or craftsmanship.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Ecker remarked that even if the porch had been added in 1903, it could still have historical significance.

Mr. Jack commented that the house had experienced numerous alterations and there was no architectural significance in the way the house addresses the street as so many new buildings had been constructed on the block, and stated that he wondered what the street would look like in ten years.

Mr. Kripper began commenting on the future design; Mr. Elperin stated that the Commission could not discuss that.

Mr. King stated that he thought the building is coherent, and would be in favor of upholding staff's initial determination.

Mr. Elperin commented that he thought the house was interesting, and while there were odd parts and additions, it still had a lot of character.

Mr. King moved to uphold staff's initial determination of significance and impose a twelve month stay of demolition which would expire on June 9, 2021. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion. Six voted in favor, and one voted against. The motion passed.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

**41 Crafts Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install wrought iron posts and railings on existing stone steps in front of the house and down to the street (Thomas and Rosemary Ashby, applicants).

Ms. Birmingham presented the case.

Wes Wirth, Thomas Wirth Associates, commented that they had tried to blend the proposal in with the character of the neighborhood, and wanted to use the highest quality of materials.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Panciera stated that he had no concerns with the proposal. Mr. Kleiner and Mr. Batchelor commented that it was a nice application.

The Commissioners and Mr. Wirth discussed the use of wrought iron and steel.

Mr. Elperin asked about painting plans. Mr. Wirth responded that the plan was to use a three part epoxy or colored galvanized. Ms. Ecker remarked that she had used galvanized on her house.

Mr. Elperin moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Kleiner seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

**166 Walnut Street (Pill Hill LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace wood gutters and fascia board with fiberglass gutters and composite fascia board. (Trustees of the 166 Walnut St. Condo Association, applicant).

Ms. Birmingham presented the case.

Emily Jacobsen, condo owner, stated that she was proud of her building and wanted the gutters to look appropriate. Further Ms. Jacobsen commented that the wood gutters were rotted and causing issues, and that fiberglass gutters would be a good step towards improving the maintenance and longevity of the building.

Steve Vogel, condo owner, stated that he felt the fiberglass gutters were a good choice and would help protect the historic structure.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Ecker commented that she had no issue with the application, and that the Commission had discussed at length the use and allowance of fiberglass gutters in a local historic district in the Design Guidelines for Local Historic District committee earlier in the year.

Mr. Batchelor remarked that the Commission should keep track of the applications. Mr. Elperin agreed that the Commission should monitor the cases over the years, and that a precedent should not be set.

Mr. Batchelor asked about the mitered corners, and how that would be matched; Mr. Batchelor further suggested that the detail could be reviewed by staff.

Mr. Batchelor made a motion to approve the fiberglass gutters with the requirement that all other materials and elements remain wood, and that a detail of the corner would be submitted to staff for approval. Additionally, the Commission would begin tracking fiberglass gutter installations in local historic districts. Mr. Jack seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

**35 Walnut Place (Pill Hill LHD)** – Application for a Retroactive Certificate of Appropriateness to replace wood gutters with copper gutters (Columbia Contracting, applicant).

Ms. Birmingham presented the case.

Kate Durrane, Columbia Contracting, remarked that they had not realized the house was in a historic district and apologized for starting the work without approvals.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Elperin asked if they intended to paint the gutters. Ms. Durrane remarked that the intention was not to paint the gutters and allow them to age. The Commissioners discussed whether or not to have the gutters painted. Mr. King remarked that he had no issues with the copper gutters, and with them being left unpainted.

Ms. Ecker remarked that copper gutters are perfectly common on a brick house. Mr. Kleiner stated that the material was appropriate and consistent with the Design Guidelines for Local Historic Districts

Mr. Elperin asked about the dentils. Ms. Durrane stated that everything else would be repaired or replaced in kind.

Mr. King moved to approve the retroactive application as submitted. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

**135 Crafts Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD)** – Application for a Retroactive Certificate of Appropriateness to replace wood gutters with copper or fiberglass gutters (Skalleberg, Atle & Anabelle Desangles, applicants).

Ms. McCarthy presented the case.

Ed Mayo, Fibergutter, remarked about the history of fiberglass gutters and his company.

Atle Skalleberg, owner, commented that they had located leaks and wanted to protect the house.

There was no public comment.

190  
191 Mr. Panciera remarked that he did not think this house should have copper gutters, which left the  
192 Commission with fiberglass. Further Mr. Panciera stated he had no issues with fiberglass gutters,  
193 but wanted to monitor it over the years as the Commission will continue to see applications for  
194 fiberglass gutters in local historic districts.

195  
196 The Commissioners discussed allowing fiberglass gutters in local historic districts. Mr. Jack  
197 commented that the situation was an interesting one which should be monitored. Mr. Elperin  
198 remarked that he thought fiberglass gutters will stand up better. Ms. Armstrong stated that it raises  
199 an issue of transparency, and that the Commission should continue updating the Design Guidelines  
200 for Local Historic Districts to include language about fiberglass gutters and why the Commission  
201 was open to allowing them. Mr. King echoed Ms. Armstrong's comments and stated that the  
202 approval of fiberglass gutters was a huge departure for the Commission and should be explained in  
203 the Design Guidelines for Local Historic Districts.

204  
205 Mr. King noted that the applicants installed a PVC fascia board. The Commissioners discussed the  
206 fascia board. Ms. Armstrong stated that she had thought the point of the fiberglass gutters were to  
207 protect other elements of the house such as the fascia. Mr. Batchelor remarked that the Commission  
208 should draw the line at the fiberglass gutters and that the fascia board and other elements should  
209 remain wood. Further Mr. Batchelor commented that he did not favor a non-wood fascia in the case  
210 of the application.

211  
212 Mr. Panciera commented that he did not want to the Commission to be in a position to allow  
213 fiberglass downspouts.

214  
215 Mr. Elperin moved to allow the gutters to be fiberglass with the requirement that the installed PVC  
216 fascia board be replaced with wood where visible from a public way; and that the aluminum  
217 downspouts could be replaced in kind, not with fiberglass. Mr. King seconded the motion. All  
218 voted in favor.

219  
220 **27 Upland Road (Pill Hill LHD)** – Application for a Retroactive Certificate of Appropriateness to  
221 replace wood windows with wood windows (Tom Chen, applicant).

222  
223 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.

224  
225 Tom Chen, owner, discussed the stop work order issued by the building department, and that the  
226 second violation was not done on purpose. Further Mr. Chen remarked that he wanted to move  
227 forward and would replace the windows with appropriate windows.

228  
229 There was no public comment.

230  
231 Mr. Batchelor commented that they were ending in the right place, and thanked the owner for  
232 coming around.

233  
234 Mr. Elperin stated that the existing dimensions should be verified, and asked if the plan was to keep  
235 the existing openings. Mr. Chen replied that the openings would not be changed, and that the  
236 manufacturer would verify the dimensions on site.

238 Mr. Elperin moved to approve the retroactive application with the understanding that the  
239 replacements windows will fit within the existing openings and casings on the house. Mr. King  
240 seconded the motion. All voted in favor.  
241  
242 Mr. Elperin adjourned the hearing.  
243